

***ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS***

*In accordance with the provisions of the Massachusetts General laws, Chapter 30A, Section 20, notice is hereby given for the following meeting of the:*

***Arlington School Committee  
School Committee Meeting  
Thursday, March 31, 2016  
6:00 PM***

*CIAA Subcommittee Meeting*

*Arlington High School  
School Committee Room, 6th Floor  
869 Mass Avenue  
Arlington, MA 02476*

*Approval of January 14, 2016 Minutes*

*Public Participation*

*Gibbs Options (should the School Committee vote favorable to use the building for a middle school):*

- *All 6th Graders Town-Wide @ Gibbs*
- *East Arlington (Hardy/Thompson) 6th, 7th, and 8th Graders at Gibbs*

*New Business*

*Date for next meeting, if necessary*

*Adjournment*

*The listings of matters are those reasonably anticipated by the Chair; which may be discussed at the meeting. Not all items listed may in fact be discussed and other items not listed may also be brought up for discussion to the extent permitted by law.*

*Stated times and time amounts, listed in parenthesis, are the estimated amount of time for that particular agenda item. Actual times may be shorter or longer depending on the time needed to fully explore the topic.*

*Submitted by Jeff Thielman, Chair*



## **Town of Arlington, Massachusetts**

---

### **Approval of January 14, 2016 Minutes**

#### **ATTACHMENTS:**

| Type      | File Name                       | Description                  |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| ▢ Minutes | CIAA_Minutes_1_14_16_DRAFT.docx | CIAA Draft Minutes 1/14 2016 |

Arlington School Committee  
Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment & Accountability Subcommittee

Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, January 14, 2016 @ 5:30 p.m.

Attendance

Subcommittee Members: Jeff Thielman (Chair), Judson Pierce, Cindy Starks

District Leadership: Kathleen Bodie, Ed.D. (Superintendent), Matthew Janger, Ph. D. (Principal, Arlington High School), Bill McCarthy (Vice Principal, Arlington High School)

The meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m.

- 1. The minutes of the December 10, 2015 meeting were approved. Motion by Cindy Starks, second by Mr. Thielman. Approved 2-0. Mr. Pierce arrived after the vote.**
- 2. Update to AHS 2016-17 Program of Studies**
  - Dr. Janger and Mr. McCarthy explained that the revised Program of Studies changes the final date for a change of course from the current six weeks after the start of school (for a one-year class) to three weeks.
  - In addition, the Program of Studies adds new courses in poetry, language, Family & Consumer Sciences, Art, Math, and Social Studies.
  - Four courses were eliminated because of a lack of interest.
  - **The Subcommittee voted to adopt the changes, 3-0 (Pierce motion, Starks second) and recommend them for approval to the full School Committee.**
- 3. Discussion of Superintendent evaluation process and procedures. The subcommittee adopted the following protocol to present for first read to the full School Committee:**

Timeline

Per policy CBI, by March 31, 2016, the Superintendent shall present progress on her goals for the 2015-16 school year, and by September 30, 2016, the Superintendent shall present “evidence of the progress made on the previous year’s approved goals, including standards, indicators and elements the School Committee and Superintendent agreed to evaluate.”

Evidence for each standard

- Standard I: Instructional Leadership
  - Vision statement or another document describing instructional leadership in the Arlington Public Schools
  - The teacher leadership curriculum within the APS professional development plan

- PARCC scores, correlated with prior MCAS results, showing academic performance outcomes of Arlington students, K-12, including subgroups.
- Standard 2: Management and Operations
  - Budget presentation to the School Committee, Finance Committee and Town Meeting
  - Reports, materials, minutes of the School Enrollment Task Force
  - SC members' observations of the Superintendent in public meetings and evidence of her attendance at public meetings.
- Standard 3: Family and Community Engagement
  - Newsletter
  - List of events of the past year designed to engage the public in school issues
  - Results of a survey of parents and community members of APS issues (if conducted by the School Committee's Community Relations subcommittee)
- Standard 4: Professional Culture
  - Annual staff survey results. Survey to be drafted by the Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Accountability Subcommittee in April and distributed to staff in May.

Evidence for two practice goals from 2015-16 goal statement approved on 6/11/15

- Goal 1.4: Close the Achievement Gap in APS. Evidence required:
  - PARCC reports (same information requested for Standard I, Instructional Leadership)
- Goal 3.1: Develop a plan to address space needs related to anticipate enrollment growth over the next ten years. Evidence required:
  - Dr. McKibben Report
  - Plan to respond to the report, including a plan for enrollment growth at all three levels- high school, middle school, and elementary school.
  - Summary of work with the MSBA

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.



## **Town of Arlington, Massachusetts**

---

**Gibbs Options (should the School Committee vote favorable to use the building for a middle school):**

**Summary:**

- All 6th Graders Town-Wide @ Gibbs
- East Arlington (Hardy/Thompson) 6th, 7th, and 8th Graders at Gibbs

**ATTACHMENTS:**

| Type            | File Name                        | Description   |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|---------------|
| Backup Material | K-6_Elementary_Proposal_(2).docx | Gibbs Options |

March 7, 2016

To: School Enrollment Task Force

From: Kathleen Bodie

Re: K-6 Option to Address Enrollment Increases At the Middle and Elementary Schools

The purpose of this memo is to address the proposal to create eight K-6 elementary schools (which would require the use of Gibbs) as a solution to address expected enrollment increases at the middle school, Thompson and Hardy

**History:** The discussion to move the sixth grade to the middle school began in 1992. The middle school was renovated beginning in 1996. The renovation project included a wing for the sixth grade. During the two years of construction, the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade were housed in the high school. The sixth grade moved to the Ottoson in September 1998. For the last 28 years, Ottoson has been a 6-8 middle school. Over the course of these years, a very strong and robust educational program has been in place for sixth grade students.

***Would eight K-6 elementary schools provide sufficient classroom and specialist space to accommodate the expected enrollment increases at both the elementary and middle school levels?***

### **Classrooms Needed:**

The October 2015 sixth grade enrollment was 410 students. Enrollment at this grade is expected to peak at 478 students in the next ten years. Assuming, 22 students per classroom (current elementary average is 22.2); the sixth grade at its peak will require 22 classrooms. In 2017-2018, if sixth grade students are dispersed to elementary schools, they will require 20 classrooms. In addition, the special education Supported Learning Center Program will require two additional classrooms in order to be in compliance with age range regulations for a total of

24 classrooms needed at the peak. This number of classrooms does not include any other needed specialist spaces.

Given the enrollment forecast for both Thompson and Hardy in the next 10 years, each school will need four classrooms at each grade level. Thompson, therefore, will need five additional classrooms than it presently has; Hardy will need three (likely more with a Mugar development).

Gibbs can be reconfigured for 24 classrooms. Stratton will have 2-3 rooms that could be reconfigured as general education classrooms (1 of the available 3 may need to be reconfigured for reading support, so the count will only include 2 available classrooms for this analysis). Peirce will have two classrooms, possibly three (if not held for special education). The total available classrooms with Gibbs is 28 (without third classroom at Peirce).

Needed: 32 (at 6<sup>th</sup> grade peak including Thompson and Hardy)

Available: 28 (with Gibbs; leaves no capacity unless convert music and art rooms to classrooms)

***Could a K-6 Elementary School at Gibbs be created without extensive redistricting?***

The simple answer is “no”. Thompson and Hardy are expected to grow to 500 and 496 students, respectively, in the next five years. If these two elementary schools stayed at their current enrollment of 425 and 415, then 156 students would attend Gibbs. If Thompson was reduced to 400 students, then 181 students would attend Gibbs from the East side of Arlington. Depending upon which scenario, either the total number of students attending Gibbs which would be either less than one-third of the Gibbs enrollment or slightly more than one-third of the enrollment required to distribute the sixth grade among eight elementary schools. In order to populate Gibbs at the appropriate number of students, every school district would be affected by re-districting.

For example, if Dallin with 21 available classrooms (does not include music or art classrooms) incorporated a sixth grade cohort, the each grade target would be approximately 66 students in order to have only three classrooms at each grade level (though one grade may need to be no more than 44 to have another SLC classroom). Currently, there is no grade at Dallin with only 66 students; the range is 68 to 94. Students in the Dallin district would need to be redistricted to Peirce or Brackett. In turn, students at Peirce and Brackett would be redistricted to Stratton and Bishop and approximately 300 students redistricted to Gibbs. In order to achieve the enrollment targets for each school, families could not be grandfathered to their current school.

Another issue with redistricting is that there will likely be class size inequities throughout the district. Redistricting a certain geographic area to move a certain number of students does not guarantee that the students residing in that area will be equally distributed among the grade levels.

The process to redistrict a town can be fairly lengthy and disruptive. The recent redistricting process took approximately one year.

***What are the educational impacts of moving the sixth grade to eight elementary schools?***

The middle school cluster model for sixth grade would change to an elementary model, which presents some significant challenges and the contraction of programmatic offering.

- One challenge is staffing. Currently, there are 14 core sixth grade teachers, only three of them have elementary certification. If the K-6 program initiated in 2017-2018, then we would need an additional 6 teachers for a total of 20 teachers.
- The cluster model could not be duplicated at the elementary level. While some level of departmentalization could be implemented, all 6<sup>th</sup> grade teachers would be required to teach English Language Arts (ELA). Most of



our current 6<sup>th</sup> grade teachers have not taught ELA and would require extensive professional development to teach ELA and would need to be certified to teach ELA. Current 6<sup>th</sup> grade teachers hold a content license in their field. Teachers would be required (confirmed with the Department of Secondary and Elementary Education) to obtain an elementary license or pass the MTEL exam in any content area they teach, if more than 20% of their assignment, which would be the case if they were teaching ELA.

- Currently, sixth grade students can choose among four world languages (Spanish, French, Mandarin and Latin). In a K-6 model, we could still offer a foreign language curriculum, but it would be limited to one language per school and would require additional staffing. Ideally, offering a language in the sixth grade would present an opportunity to expand language instruction to other elementary grades, but expansion would require a much more significant increase in staffing.
- Currently, all sixth grade students take technology/engineering. While some curriculum topics could be incorporated into the sixth grade science curriculum, students will not have the lab program that they presently have.
- Currently, sixth grade students take Digital Modeling Lab (DML) every other day for a whole year. The students learn the fundamentals of computer science, coding and sequential thinking skills, digital citizenship and website development. While some elements of the course could be offered to 6<sup>th</sup> grade students, the program would have a more limited scope and time duration.
- Currently, all middle school students take Family and Consumer Science (FACS). This course would not be offered to 6<sup>th</sup> grade students because the elementary schools would not have the required infrastructure or space.
- Currently, students entering 6<sup>th</sup> grade are given the opportunity to qualify to by-pass sixth grade mathematics and enroll directly into a seventh grade mathematics class. This opportunity could not be offered in the K-6 model, nor would an on-site seventh grade mathematics classes be offered because of the limited number of students in each elementary school who would qualify.

- We could not offer ACE to 6<sup>th</sup> grade students in a K-6 model.
- Some of the after-school program available to sixth grade students at the middle school would likely not be available at each elementary school, such as robotics, math team, and the National History Day competition. The AM/PM program would only be available for 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade students.
- The sixth grade instrumental and choral music program would drastically change. An all-sixth grade band, orchestra and chorus could be created as an after-school program at Ottoson, which would require students from all eight schools to travel to Ottoson. Otherwise, sixth grade students would be incorporated into each elementary school's band and orchestra and be invited to participate in the all-school elementary chorus.
- Sixth grade students would likely not participate in the middle school play because of logistics. They could participate in their own elementary school play (if an option) or in Children's Theatre productions.
- Elementary libraries would have to be updated with developmentally appropriate books. Books currently in the OMS library would not be removed from Ottoson.

***Would there be incremental costs associated with a K-6 model?***

There would be increased costs beyond the normally increasing costs associated with enrollment growth, which would include a principal, secretary, nurse, and teachers (a social worker could be transferred from OMS to Gibbs). We would need an additional 6 classroom teachers in 2017-2018. It would take considerably more analysis to quantify the costs of additional special education, world language, and ELL teachers, and specialists.